#### IMPACT FEE ADMINISTRATOR REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

### **IMPACT FEE APPEAL - IFA-0090001:**

APPELLANT:

Katie Halperin

9025 Turnberry Circle Lincoln, Nebraska 68526

PROPERTY:

1525 S 19 Street - IF080601 1537 S 19 Street - IF080600

**REQUEST:** 

The appellant is appealing from the Water System, Water Distribution, and Wastewater Impact Fees Determinations dated July 10, 2008. The appellant argues that the replacement of two-1" water meters with two-1 1/2" water meters, at the project location, does not create an additional demand on the water system, water distribution supply, or wastewater

system.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Denial

#### **REASONS:**

This appeal does not meet any of the stipulations required for reduction in an Impact Fees. According to Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.110 of the Impact Fee Ordinance, the City Council shall not waive fees unless there is a finding that the fee was incorrectly calculated or that there are unusual circumstances which demonstrate that appeal of the fee for the development would be unfair or unjust. Those findings do not exist in this matter.

The appeal does not meet any of the stipulations required for reduction according to 27.82.050 Imposition of Impact Fees ((d) Calculating Fees through an Independent Fee Calculation Study) as the appellant did not request that the Impact Fee Administrator determine the amount of required Impact Fees for the proposed development by reference to a qualified professional independent fee calculation study provided at the appellant's cost.

Impact Fee applications (IF080600, IF080601, IF080602, and IF080603) were not paid under protest by appellant; and per the Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.110 (i) Appeals must be filed with the City Clerk within ten days after the determination for which the appeal is being filed. Appellant's "Notice of Appeal" was filed 176 days after the date of determination.

The Impact Fees were correctly calculated based upon the Impact Fee Schedule. The Impact Fees are based on the net increase in the fee for the new use as compared to the previous use, and the exclusion areas of the Downtown/Antelope Valley area apply to Arterial Street and Parks and Trails Impact Fees only.

#### **FACTS:**

- 1. The appeal does not meet any of the stipulations according to 27.82.050 Imposition of Impact Fees (d) Calculating Fees through an Independent Fee Calculation Study. If such person (appellant) elects not to have the Impact Fee determined according to the Impact Fee schedules, such person (appellant) may request that the Impact Fee Administrator determine the amount of a required Impact Fee for the proposed development by reference to an independent fee calculation study prepared at such person's (appellant's) cost by a qualified professional in the preparation of such analysis. The letter from Mr. J. Matt Carlson, Sawhorse, does not provide a professional analysis to support Appellant's request for reduction. (Attachment B)
- 2. The Water and Wastewater Impact Fees are based on meter capacity and not on water use or on population of the development. The wells, treatment facilities, pumping and storage facilities, and water distribution mains are all sized to meet the maximum day or maximum hour demands of all customers. The larger the meter, the larger the potential demand. <sup>1</sup>
- 3. The Notice of Appeal narrative states that "According to our plumbing contractors, a 1" supply could have been sufficient, but a 1.5" supply is appropriate for this and similar projects". (Attachment A) Additionally, the letter from Saw Horse states "In order to increase the overall system capacity, we ultimately designed for (2) 1 ½" taps on the main and metering systems that would then reduce to 1" feeds for each of the units." (Attachment B) Thus, the appellant chose to increase the system capacity for this development.
- 4. The Notice of Appeal references the Arterial Street Impact Fees. The Arterial Street Impact Fees are included in this appeal. Credit was provided for the prior use. The net difference due for Arterial Street Impact Fees was -0-. (Attachment C)
- 5. Appellant incorrectly states the Notice of Appeal is to be filed 10 days after payment of the Impact Fee. The Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.11 (i) states the appeals must be filed with the City Clerk within ten days after the determination for which the appeal is being filed. The Impact Fee Applications (IF080600, IF080601, IF080602, and IF080603) were not paid under protest by appellant. Conversations did take place with appellants representative, Mr. Badami, regarding reductions, independent study options, and appeal time lines prior to determinations. The Impact Fee Applications were filed June 13, 2008 at Building and Safety and paid October 14, 2008. The Impact Fee Determination's were made on July 10, 2008. The Appellant filed the Notice of Appeal 176 days after the determination, on January 2, 2009.
- 6. The Water/Wastewater Utilities Impact Fees were correctly calculated based upon the Water/Wastewater Impact Fee Schedule. Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.050(4) provides that if a person is applying for a permit to allow a change of meter size the Impact Fee shall be based on the net increase in the fee for the new meter size as compared to the previous use. Public Works and Utilities Business Office records indicate the previous water meters at 1531 S 19<sup>th</sup> Street was a 1" water meter; and 1541 S 19<sup>th</sup> Street was a 1" water meter. Appellant is replacing the two 1" water meters with two 1 ½" water meters. Calculating the Water/Wastewater Impact Fee pursuant to Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.050 (4): the prior 1"water meter

Water/Wastewater Utility Impact Fee is a credit of \$3140 per each meter. (Water System Fee is \$1,296; Water Distribution Fee is \$805; and the Wastewater Fee is \$1,039). The new 1 ½" water meter Water/Wastewater Utility Impact Fee is a charge of \$6,281 (Water System Fee is \$2,592; Water Distribution Fee is \$1,610; and the Wastewater Fee is \$2,079). Therefore, calculating the Water/Wastewater Impact Fee pursuant to Lincoln Municipal Code § 27.82.050 (4) the Water/Wastewater Utility Impact Fee 1 ½ " meter is a fee of \$6,281 - the 1" meter is a fee of \$3,140 = a net amount due of \$3,141 per each meter; or \$6,282 total Water/Wastewater Utility Impact Fee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Duncan and Associates, "Lincoln Impact Fee Study", October 2002

# FILED IMPACT FEECLERK'S OFFICE NOTICE OF APPEAL 200 JAN 2 AM 11 26

This appeal must be filed with the City Clerk within 10 days affel The Offe of the determination for which the appeal is being filed. Although the fees may be reduced via this appeal process, the fees may NOT be waived using the appeal process. A City Council determination shall be final

Appeal of Impact Fee Determination for Property Located at:
1537 5, 19th
1525 S. 19th
1533 S.19th
1529 5.19th
Date:
Building Permit Application No. BOSO1544, BOSO1545
At the next regular City Council meeting following the filing of the appeal the Council will schedule a time at
place for hearing the appeal. The City Clerk shall mail notice of the hearing to the party at the address give below.
The following party alleges a grievance related to Impact Fees:
Name: Katie Halperin
Company (if Applicable): Washington Square LLC
Company (if Applicable): Washington Square LLC Address: 9025 Tornberry Cir
City, State, Zip: Lincoln, NE 68526
Phone: 402-486-4774
Email Address: KPHC Neb Home Sales, com
Written Explanation of why the party feels a Determination was in Error: Attach written explanation of why th appellant feels that a determination was in error.
See Attached
Final Determination by Council on Day of

## Impact Fee Notice of Appeal Washington Square Redevelopment Project

This is a request to have the impact fees paid for the Washington Square Redevelopment project be waived and refunded accordingly. This appeal is being brought forward late in the process due to conflicting communication that came from a variety of staff from the City of Lincoln. Staff names are excluded from the following chronology as this request is not an indictment of any specific staff members.

The rationale for appeal is:

At the time I submitted for plan reviews, I contacted City staff expressing my desire to appeal the impact fees. I was told that there was "nothing to appeal until the fees were paid". The day I paid for the building permit and the impact fees (10-14-08), I once again contacted City staff. Staff told me the first step would be to contact Asst. City Attorney, Rick Peo for a determination if there was an exemption, under LMC 27.82.060. City staff contacted Mr. Peo and asked the question. Weeks later, Mr. Peo advised me, in writing, that no exemption existed for this project. I once again asked City staff how to appeal the impact fees. At that time I was told by City staff that I had missed the deadline. The deadline was 10 days after I filed and paid for plan reviews.

At this point, I made an appointment to speak to Mr. Peo. We met on December 19, 2008. I asked Mr. Peo the correct procedure to file an appeal. He said I needed to submit an "Impact Fee Notice of Appeal" which, due to the timeliness of my appeal, may be rejected. I explained to him that City staff had no idea on the correct appeal procedure and told him the above events. Mr. Peo smiled and said "he wasn't surprised staff didn't know what to do. We don't get many appeals".

The rationale for an exemption for Washington Square is:

This project was reengineered to minimize the impact City infrastructure. The project general contractor can provide exacting details of the changes in plans that were made. The changes, which increased costs to me as the developer, result in a project that significantly reduce the impact n the City and neighborhood. This is represented by an estimate of \$40,000 impact fees for this project as a greenfield development versus the current \$6,000 impact fee as paid.

Other Lincoln redevelopment areas are exempt from impact fees including Antelope Valley and Downtown.

According to the 2002 Impact Fee Report, impact fees were intended to assess part of the cost for new infrastructure to new development that is necessitating the infrastructure cost.

- ▶ Pg. 1: The report "...estimates the net cost to accommodate new development..."
- Pg. 23: "The cost of the capacity to serve an additional SFE (single family equivalent) customer is dependent on the average demand for water."

**₽** 

Washington Square is redeveloping land to a lesser density than its prior use. It is not adding more customers to the system. The apartment buildings that were torn down had 18 units. I estimate that an average of 4 people lived in each unit for a total of 72 residents. Washington Square has 16 units and I estimate an average occupancy of 3 people or 48 residents. That is a reduction of 24 residents impacting the water/sewer/streets. Washington Square is being built to current code and standards with low-flow water fixtures reducing the burden on the City systems even though the number of explicit bathrooms has increased.

The use of 1.5" main lines and water meters instead of 1" previously existing meters has been questioned. The supply has been selected to assure appropriate water pressure throughout the development. The length of the buildings require the larger supply to assure that the far ends of the development have adequate water pressure. According to our plumbing contractors, a 1" supply could have been sufficient, but a 1.5" supply is appropriate for this and similar projects..

This project is reducing the impact on City streets. The previous apartment buildings had 19 off street parking spaces for 72 residents. Washington Square will have 32 parking spaces for 48 estimated residents. There are 2 parking spaces per unit.

In closing, please recognize that this project reduces impact on city infrastructure and accordingly should not be subject to impact fees. The delay in the submission of this appeal was due to conflicting and incorrect information provided by members of City staff. As a first of kind development, this confusion is understandable yet we should not be punished for pushing forward a project that will serve the City and its citizens. It is vital that developers are given sufficient support to encourage redevelopment and assure success within the City core.

Thank you for your consideration of this appeal and your continued support of our project.

#### ATTACHMENT B



October 31, 2008

Katie Halperin Washington Square, LLC PO Box 6165 Lincoln, NE 68506-0165

Katie.

In sizing the utilities, specifically the domestic water services, for the Washington Square Project, we considered several options.

A single 2½ "tap would have been sufficient to meet the usage and pressure requirements for the project. However, since the city water department doesn't use 2½ "taps, we would have had to increase the size to a 3" tap. By doing so, the impact fees associated with the project nearly tripled.

As a result, we explored the use of the existing 1" taps -- one for each of the two properties that make up the project. By splitting the metering configuration for the project into two groups of seven units, we were able to meet the usage requirements of the project in terms of the number of gallons. However, ultimately we were concerned that the overall length of the lines and the need to deliver water to the third floor of each unit would result in insufficient water pressure for the units at the end of the trunk line. In order to increase the overall system capability, we ultimately designed for (2) 11½" taps on the main and metering systems that would then reduce to 1" feeds for each of the units.

I hope this helps to clarify the process.

Sincerely,

J. Matt Carlson President

PRIOR USE:		podovení – Pr	NEW USE						
Per unit		Credit	IF APPLICATION NUMBER		STIND ON	FEE PER	ART, STR	APPLIED CREDIT	DIFFERENCE DUE
ARTERIAL STREETS:		505081K		ARTERIAL STREETS:					
DEMO 12 PLEX \$1,501 \$	\$18,012 ( \$9,006	(\$18,012)   F080600 (\$9,006)   F080601	IF080600 IF080601	1537 SOUTH 19 1525 SOUTH 19	7	\$1,501 \$1,501	\$10,507 \$10,507	(\$10,507) (\$10,507)	\$0.00 \$0.00
TOTAL ARTERIAL STREET IMPACT FEE CREDIT	_	(\$27,018) (F080603	F080603	1533 SOUTH 19	1SFD	\$2,466	\$2,466	(\$2,466)	\$0.00
							\$25,946	(\$27,018)	\$0.00
	entera orasteran	nigaskaankaankokkasii	3.500 的复数名名 (1945)		un cherrandum	gerlan Amerenden (2001)	orse pelanement	estaded (Bad) a traca	BASII, AMALABINIS LIIDASIN
WATER AND WASTEWATER				WATER AND WASTEWATER	WATER METER SIZE	FEE PER WATER V METER	WATER/ NET WASTEWATER DIFFERENC CREDIT E DUE		NET PAID OCTOBER 2008
ABANDONED 1531 S 19 1" METER \$3,140 ABANDONED 1541 S 19 1" METER \$3,140			IF080600 IF080601 IF080602	1537 SOUTH 19 1525 SOUTH 19 1529 SOUTH 19	1 1/2 1 1/2	\$6,281 \$6,281	(\$3,140) (\$3,140)	\$3,141 \$3,141	\$3,141 \$3,141
TOTAL WATERWASTEWATER IMPACT FEE CREDIT		(\$6,280)	IF080603	1533 SOUTH 19		\$12,562	(\$6,280)	\$6,282	